

Fact sheet on the new nuclear weapons debate

Toward a World Free of Nuclear Weapons The Main Sources

(Last updated 20 February 2013)

Introduction

The new international political dynamic toward a world free of nuclear weapons is generally considered to have started with an op-ed article in the Wall Street Journal of 4 January 2007 by a bipartisan group of four U.S. security veterans: George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger and Sam Nunn. They became known as 'The Gang of Four' or 'The Four Horsemen (of the Apocalypse)'. New was that they did not advocate drastic reductions alone or a 'minimum deterrence' but saw 'zero' nuclear weapons as the only solution for the danger of nuclear weapons being used in the future.

By the end of 2008, in the USA some two thirds of all living former secretaries of state, secretaries of defense and national security advisors were believed to support this proposal. A new phase started when the new U.S. President Barack Obama made the goal of 'zero nuclear weapons' a centerpiece of his new foreign policy, culminating in his speech in Prague on 5 April 2009.

In Europe, it took one and a half year before the first multi-partisan group similar to Kissinger et al. came into being, but today groups of (mainly former) politicians from 12 countries have published their endorsements, incl. from Canada and S. Korea.

The purpose of this fact sheet is to facilitate access to these main sources of the new nuclear debate, most of which are summarized. In some cases, personal comments are added. A conclusion is that European politics keeps lagging behind and provides insufficient support to the new U.S. policy.

This fact sheet consists of four parts:

1. THE MAIN ARTICLES THAT HAVE APPEARED THUS FAR BY MULTI-PARTISAN GROUPS OF LEADING FORMER STATESMEN PLUS SOME BACKGROUND INTERVIEWS, SPEECHES AND ARTICLES BY THE SAME PERSONS. *Contains all links of op-eds by 'gangs of four' from US, UK, Italy, Germany, Poland, Norway, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Canada, S. Korea, Russia, Finland.*
2. SOME RESPONSES BY POLITICIANS IN OFFICE (INCL. PRESIDENT OBAMA'S PRAGUE SPEECH). *President Obama's Prague speech in April 2009 marked the real change in U.S. policy following the original appeal by Kissinger et al. The list of links ends in 2010, as many new texts were focused on specific issues such as the NPT, New START and NATO policy.*

APPENDIX I: COMMENTS LH ON THE MEASURES ADVOCATED (OR NOT ADVOCATED) AND A NOTE OF DISAPPOINTMENT

APPENDIX II: SOME ORGANIZATIONS WORKING FOR 'ZERO' INVOLVING (FORMER) OFFICIALS. *This list of links is incomplete but may be of some help.*

Corrections and additions are welcome: hogebrink@planet.nl . This fact sheet has been last updated on 20 February 2013 for the nuclear disarmament section of the website of the *Church and Society Commission of the Conference of European Churches*. See <http://csc.ceceurope.org/issues/nuclear-disarmament/> .

1. THE MAIN ARTICLES THAT HAVE APPEARED THUS FAR, esp. by 'gangs of four' or rather: multi-partisan groups of former statesmen and high officials

Comment LH: the titles of op-eds by groups of (former) politicians have been underlined, not the titles of individual contributions or comments.

A list of statements organized by country can be found on the Pugwash website, see http://www.pugwash.org/reports/nw/nuclear-weapons-free-statements/NFWF_statements.htm . Another list - not complete - is on the website of the Nuclear Security Project:

http://www.nuclearsecurityproject.org/site/c.mjJXJbMMIoE/b.3506933/k.C34D/Articles_and_Opeds.htm . Sometimes, if links provided below don't work or if you have to pay, you may find the articles on these websites.

In 2012, a 478 p. book has been published, describing the process in detail, with much information about the 'cold warriors' who initiated the debate. The author worked on defense and security issues for *The New York Times* for thirty years. Philip Taubman, *The Partnership. Five Cold Warriors and their Quest to Ban the Bomb*. New York (HarperCollins), 2012.

1.01 'Bombs Away'

by Max M. Kampelman

The New York Times, April 24, 2006

<http://www.nytimes.com/2006/04/24/opinion/24kampelman.html>

Although the new nuclear debate is generally considered to have started with the January 2007 op-ed below by four renowned US security veterans, this article by President Reagan's former negotiator Max Kampelman was the real trigger. At the time of writing, Kampelman was 85. He writes: "(...) *I have never been more worried about the future for my children and grandchildren than I am today*". Telling about his own experience with Reagan's first proposal to eliminate all nuclear weapons (*and the consternation it caused!*), he argues that American foreign policy needs "to find a way to move from what 'is' - a world with the risk of increasing global disaster - to what 'ought' to be, a peaceful, civilized world free of weapons of mass destruction." His proposal is that President Bush should appear before the UN General Assembly and call for a resolution to eliminate all weapons of mass destruction. The Security Council should be assigned the task to develop the regime. In his late 80ies, Kampelman was still 'on the road', advocating his proposal both to high officials and local groups. He died in January 2013.

1.02. 'A World Free of Nuclear Weapons'

by George P. Shultz, William J. Perry, Henry A. Kissinger and Sam Nunn

The Wall Street Journal, January 4, 2007

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB116787515251566636.html>

The argument in this first op-ed by the four elder statesmen is that nuclear weapons have been essential in maintaining international security during the Cold War, but it is far from certain that the old mutual Soviet-American deterrence system can be replicated in today's world without increasing the risk that nuclear weapons will be used. The emergence of new nuclear weapon states like possibly Iran and North Korea and, potentially, of non-state terrorist groups with nuclear weapons presents dangers of a new

kind. Therefore, the goal – set earlier by Reagan and Gorbachev in Reykjavik in October 1986 – must be abolishing all nuclear weapons. This must be turned into a joint enterprise with leaders of countries possessing nuclear weapons. Among the steps to be taken are:

- Changing the Cold War posture of nuclear weapons to increase warning time and reduce the danger of accidents.
- Substantial reduction of the sizes of nuclear forces.
- Eliminating tactical nuclear weapons ('short range nuclear weapons designed to be forward deployed').
- Several proposals for increasing security of weapons and materials, etc.

A quote: "*Without the bold vision, the actions will not be perceived as fair or urgent. Without the actions, the vision will not be perceived as realistic or possible.*"

The op-ed referred to a conference at the Hoover Institution at Stanford in 2006, organized by George P. Shultz and Sidney D. Drell to reconsider the vision that Reagan and Gorbachev brought to Reykjavik 20 years ago. The names of 17 (former) officials endorsing the statement were added. Drell was one of the driving forces behind the op-ed in *The Wall Street Journal*, and the fifth of the 'five cold warriors' in Philip Taubman's book (see above) but had his name replaced by Kissinger's as it would be more effective to have a bi-partisan group of four former politicians, two Democrats and two Republicans. For his own account of the background, impact and the challenges ahead, see a speech by Drell on 16 March 2010 in Bonn, Germany:

<http://www.dpg-physik.de/veranstaltungen/max-von-laue-vortraege/Max-von-Laue%20lecture%20Drell%202010%20with%20figures.pdf> . See also 1.32.

1.03. 'The Nuclear Threat'

by Mikhail Gorbachev

The Wall Street Journal, January 31, 2007

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB117021711101593402.html>

A response to (and support of) the call by Kissinger et al. Gorbachev underlines the importance of his own agreements with Reagan and criticizes the policies that followed. He stresses the need for a role of Russian and European leaders.

1.04. 'Toward a Nuclear-Free World'

by George P. Shultz, William J. Perry, Henry A. Kissinger and Sam Nunn

The Wall Street Journal, January 15, 2008

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB120036422673589947.html>

In this new op-ed, the same 'gang of four' repeats its appeal of a year ago and refers to a conference in October 2007 (see below) where veterans of the past six US administrations have agreed about the importance of the vision of a world free of nuclear weapons as a guide to future nuclear policies. Further steps to be taken are spelled out, incl. a call for a dialogue within NATO and with Russia about tactical nuclear weapons, which are called "*acquisition targets for terrorists.*" Again names are added of (former) officials endorsing the statement. A quote frequently used by in later texts: "*In some respects, the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons is like the top of a very tall mountain. From the vantage point of our troubled world today, we can't even see the top of the mountain, and it is tempting and easy to say we can't get there from here. But the risks from continuing to go down the mountain or standing pat are too real to ignore. We must chart a course to higher ground where the mountaintop becomes more visible.*"

(Note LH: again much emphasis on increasing warning and decision times for launching, - a measure that originally was also high on Obama's list but disappeared, see below).

1.05. 'Reykjavik Revisited: Steps Toward a World Free of Nuclear Weapons'

edited by George P. Shultz, Sidney D. Drell and James Goodby, 2008
Conference at Hoover Institution, 24-25 October 2007

<http://www.hoover.org/publications/books/online/15766737.html>

Book with report of the two-day conference involving again Kissinger, Nunn, Perry, Shultz and many other former (and current) officials, incl. Max Kampelman (see 1.01. 1.09 and 1.10).

1.06. Interview with Sam Nunn

Arms Control Today, March 2008

<http://www.armscontrol.org/print/2745>

For background, see also <http://www.armscontrol.org/print/2820>. Nunn gives priority to extending warning time for firing missiles; he calls the current alert posture "*insane*". He also argues that progress between the US and Russia will be difficult unless some accommodation is found on missile defense.

1.07. Start worrying and learn to ditch the bomb. It won't be easy, but a world free of nuclear weapons is possible'

by Douglas Hurd, Malcolm Rifkind, David Owen and George Robertson

The Times, June 30, 2008

http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/columnists/guest_contributors/article4237387.ece?openComment=true

A British 'gang of four' is born, consisting of three former foreign secretaries and a former NATO secretary-general. Referring to the new U.S. debate and the two op-eds by Kissinger et al. they say: "*A comparable debate is now needed in this country and across Europe.*" Strong emphasis on reductions and other measures, and support of the ultimate aspiration of a world free of nuclear weapons. The UK has already reduced significantly over the past 20 years, but eventually also Britain, France and other existing nuclear powers will need to consider further contributions.

(Note LH: It is sobering to note that, after the first *Wall Street Journal* op-ed by Kissinger et al., it took one and a half year before a similar initiative was taken in Europe).

1.08. 'For A Nuclear Weapon Free World'

by Massimo D'Alema, Gianfranco Fini, Giorgio La Malfa, Arturo Parisi, Francesco Calogero
Corriera della Sera, July 24, 2008

http://www.2020visioncampaign.org/pages/446/Leading_Italian_politicians_join_in_call_for_nuclear_abolition

News item and article on website of 2020 Vision Campaign. Italian 'gang of five' of one former prime minister, three former ministers and a former general secretary of Pugwash respond to the two appeals by Kissinger et al., plus the group from the UK. Emphasis on CTBT, FMCT and success of 2010 NPT Review Conference. "*Italy and Europe can and must do what they can to promote the path towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons.*"

1.09. 'Nuclear Weapons: An Existential Threat to Humanity'

by Max M. Kampelman and Thomas Graham, Jr.
CBTBO Spectrum 11, September 2008

http://www.ctbto.org/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/Spectrum/2008_Sept_spectrum11_p10-11.pdf

Amb. Kampelman and Amb. Graham are former arms control negotiators and were driving forces behind the op-ed articles by Kissinger et al. discussed above.

1.10. Religion And Politics. There Is Power In The 'Ought'

by Max Kampelman

Presentation at annual Conference of Christian Approaches to Defense and Disarmament, Washington, September 22, 2008

http://website.lineone.net/~ccadd/ic2008_kampelman.htm

Strong moral appeal by one of the founding fathers of the new movement for a nuclear-free world (Kampelman was 87 years old at the time of this speech, see 1.01).

1.11. 'Toward a nuclear-free world: a German view'

by Helmut Schmidt, Richard von Weizsäcker, Egon Bahr and Hans-Dietrich Genscher
International Herald Tribune, January 9, 2009

<http://www.ihf.com/articles/2009/01/09/opinion/edschmidt.php?page=1>

Unreserved support for Kissinger et al. by a new German cross-party group of four former political leaders. To the now usual list of steps (new START treaty, CTBT, FMCT, success of NPT Review, etc) they add: "*All short-range nuclear weapons must be destroyed.*" They also emphasize the importance of maintaining post Cold War stability in Europe, incl. CFE (Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe). Warning against missile defense arrangements without agreement with Russia. Security cooperation in Europe and northern hemisphere. Proposal of a non-first-use treaty between the nuclear weapons states. And as a German contribution "*all remaining U.S. nuclear warheads should be withdrawn from German territory.*"

1.12. Our Nuclear Nightmare

by Henry A. Kissinger

Newsweek, February 16, 2009

<http://www.newsweek.com/id/183673>

Same arguments as in earlier publications, and well-stated. Please note that Kissinger et al. in the measures they advocate in their op-ed pieces have not included a halt to all modernization. In this article Kissinger states: "*So long as other countries build and improve their nuclear arsenals, deterrence of their use needs to be part of Western strategy. The efficiency of our weapons arsenals must be preserved.*" - Of course, this is part of the argument that the road to zero will be long. But Kissinger also creates the impression of keeping his powder dry for the (then) forthcoming struggle in the Obama administration on modernization of the nuclear weapons complex, as part of the price of having the new START treaty ratified by the U.S. Senate. See 1.29.

From now on: responding to President Obama's new policy

From now on, articles and op-eds refer to the new U.S. leadership. Immediately after Obama's inauguration on 20 January 2009, a new policy was announced on the White House website (this text was later replaced by policy progress information). A quote from the original text on 'day one': "*Move Toward a Nuclear Free World: Obama and Biden will set a goal of a world without nuclear weapons, and pursue it. (..) They will stop the development of new nuclear weapons; work with Russia to take U.S. and Russian ballistic missiles off hair*

trigger alert; seek dramatic reductions in U.S. and Russian stockpiles of nuclear weapons and material; and set a goal to expand the U.S.-Russian ban on intermediate-range missiles so that the agreement is global."

However, this message was only really taken seriously after Obama's joint statement with Medvedev on 1 April 2009 in London and Obama's speech in Prague on 5 April 2009, see: http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Joint-Statement-by-Dmitriy-A-Medvedev-and-Barack-Obama/ and http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-By-President-Barack-Obama-In-Prague-As-Delivered/

(Note LH: taking missiles off hair trigger alert disappeared in later statements).

1.13. Speeches by US and European politicians at the 2009 Munich Security Conference. Munich, February 2009

http://www.securityconference.de/archive/konferenzen/reden.php?menu_2009=&menu_konferenzen=&sprache=en&jahr=2009&

Many high-level US officials and military, incl. Biden, Kissinger, James Jones, Petraeus. Also many European speakers.

1.14 'The Unthinkable becomes Thinkable: Towards the Elimination of nuclear Weapons'

by Alexander Kwasniewski, Tadeusz Mazowiecki and Lech Walesa
Originally published in Polish in the *Gazetata Wyborcza*, April 3, 2009

http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/2009/04/08_polish_unthinkable_weapons.php

This article by a Polish 'gang of three', consisting of two former presidents and a former prime minister, has received attention in the West only months after it was published. It is an immediate response to the joint statement by Obama and Medvedev on April 1. It supports the previous initiatives, starting with Kissinger et al. It rightfully refers to the Polish Solidarity movement as having sparked the erosion of communism and the end of the bipolar world and its East-West divide. It refers to the denuclearization of Belarus, Kazakhstan and the Ukraine as a valuable lesson. *"For a new international security order, abolishing nuclear weapons is as important as respect for human rights and the rights of minorities and establishing in the world a governance based on rule of law and democracy."*

(Note LH: For an 'Open Letter to the Obama Administration from Central and Eastern Europe' with a quite different tone, signed by two of the signatories above and a number of other former dissidents, see : http://wyborcza.pl/1,75477,6825987,An_Open_Letter_to_the_Obama_Administration_from_Central.html published in *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 15 July 2009. Not a single word about the threat of nuclear weapons, but an expression of deep concern about the security needs of Central and Eastern Europe and the lack of attention in Obama's policy).

1.15. 'A Nuclear Weapons-Free World'

by Odvar Nordli, Gro Harlem Brundtland, Kåre Willoch, Kjell Magne Bondevik and Thorvald Stoltenberg
Aftenposten, June 4, 2009

http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/2009/06/04_norwegian_leaders_statement.php

A Norwegian 'gang of five' consisting of four former prime ministers and a former foreign minister endorses Kissinger et al., emphasizing the need to include tactical nuclear weapons in the negotiations and opposing the US missile shield plans.

1.16 'For Global Nuclear Disarmament, the Only Means to Prevent Anarchic Proliferation'

By Alain Juppé, Bernard Norlain, Alain Richard and Michel Rocard
Le Monde, 15 October 2009

http://www.lemonde.fr/opinions/article/2009/10/14/pour-un-desarmement-nucleaire-mondial-seule-reponse-a-la-proliferation-anarchique_1253834_3232.html

English translation:

<http://www.ploughshares.org/sites/default/files/resources/frenchhorsement.pdf>

Appeal by two former prime ministers of France, a former defence minister and a retired Air Force chief. Structured elimination of nuclear weapons is the only response to the new threats posed by local conflicts and non-state actors and by the diminishing effectiveness of the instruments of the NPT. The five nuclear weapon states "*must abandon any development of new nuclear weapons (...)*." Obama's speech in Prague of 5 April 2009 was very promising. France should help re-establish a credible non-proliferation regime and "*when the time comes, to draw the appropriate consequences of this for its own capabilities.*"

(Note LH: This appeal was quite remarkable, as so far France – and the French establishment - had been silent if not negative about Obama's new policy and France had even vetoed some positive joint statements by the EU).

1.17. 'Towards A Nuclear Weapon Free World'

by Ruud Lubbers, Max van der Stoep, Hans van Mierlo and Frits Korthals Altes
NRC Handelsblad, November 23, 2009

http://vorige.nrc.nl/opinie/article2420826.ece/Op_naar_een_kernwapenvrije_wereld

English translation:

<http://www.ikvpaxchristi.nl/files/Documenten/Veiligheid%20en%20Ontwapening/Nucleaire%20ontwapening/Lubbers%20et%20al%20auth%20version.pdf>

A multi-partisan Dutch group, consisting of one former prime minister and three former ministers of justice, defence and foreign affairs, endorses Obama's Prague speech, esp. with a view of the 2010 NPT Review Conference. "*Our support is necessary, because thus far neither NATO nor the EU have done so.*" The four argue that the Netherlands has a special responsibility as The Hague is the legal capital of the world, hosting the International Court of Justice. As a member of NATO, the Netherlands should play an active role in the revision of NATO's Strategic Concept, so "*it will lead to the withdrawal of American nuclear weapons from the territories of non-nuclear weapon states.*" As to the EU: Euratom should be an example for the worldwide role of the IAEA. And as a result of the Lisbon Treaty, the new High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the EU should play a stronger role on nuclear disarmament.

(Note LH: When the article was published in what is considered the leading Dutch newspaper, the sentence about withdrawal of U.S. TNW from Europe had been deleted, to save space... It was a signal of the lack of interest in the Dutch media for the issue. The authors requested a rectification, which of course was given).

1.18. 'How to Protect Our Nuclear Deterrent'

by George P. Shultz, William J. Perry, Henry A. Kissinger and Sam Nunn
The Wall Street Journal, January 19, 2010

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704152804574628344282735008.html>

"*Maintaining confidence in our nuclear arsenal is necessary as the number of weapons goes down*", is both the subtitle and the main message of this third op-ed by the original 'gang of four', after their articles in January 2007 and January 2008.

1.19. 'Towards a World free of Nuclear Weapons'

by Willy Claes, Jean-Luc Dehaene, Louis Michel and Guy Verhofstadt
De Standaard and *Le Soir*, February 19, 2010

<http://www.ikvpaxchristi.nl/files/Documenten/Veiligheid%20en%20Ontwapening/Nuclearre%20ontwapening/Towards%20a%20World%20free%20of%20Nuclear%20Weapons.pdf>

A Belgian multi-partisan group publishes its support of 'zero' both in Flemish and French. Two former prime ministers and two former ministers of foreign affairs (one of them also a former secretary general of NATO). The 2010 NPT Review Conference provides a unique opportunity for a new commitment. Negotiations should begin for a Nuclear Weapons Convention. The U.S. TNW in Europe no longer have any military use. "*We call on our government to take active steps within NATO for the rapid removal of these nuclear weapons, as the German government has done.*" Ideally, this would take place in negotiations with Russia. "*But sometimes we must dare to set an example and hope that it will be an inspiration to others.*"

1.20. 'Toward a world without nuclear weapons'

by Jean Chrétien, Joe Clark, Ed Broadbent and Lloyd Axworthy
The Globe and Mail, March 26, 2010

http://www.pugwash.org/reports/nw/nuclear-weapons-free-statements/NFWF_statements_Canada.htm

<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/opinions/toward-a-world-without-nuclear-weapons/article1512296/>

A multi-partisan group of four former Canadian leaders joins other statesmen and President Obama, expressing support for zero without going into details.

1.21. 'A road map for a nuclear free world'

by Lee Hong-Koo, former Prime Minister and former Minister for Unification, Han Sung Joo, former Foreign Minister and former Ambassador to U.S., Dr. Park Kwan-Yong, former Speaker of the Parliament, General Paik Sun-Yop, Former Army Chief of Staff
Source? June 22, 2010

http://www.pugwash.org/reports/nw/nuclear-weapons-free-statements/NFWF_statements_Korea.htm

Strong S. Korean endorsement of Kissinger at al. and Obama's Prague speech, related to the vision of a Korean peninsula without nuclear weapons. Advocate eight measures: strengthening NPT, U.S and Russian reductions, CTBT, FMCT, IAEA safeguards, Nuclear Security Summit (in 2012 in Korea), cooperation with peaceful use of nuclear energy, and regional problems (Middle East and North Korea Six Party Talks).

1.22. 'Moving from Nuclear Deterrence to Mutual Security'

by Yevgeny Velikhov, Igor Ivanov, Mikhail Moiseev and Yevgeny Primakov
Izvestia, October 14, 2010

http://www.pugwash.org/reports/nw/nuclear-weapons-free-statements/NFWF_statements_Russia.htm

Published again in a Russian source on October 22, 2010:

http://indrus.in/articles/2010/10/22/start_a_new_disarmament_plan04815.html

A Russian group, consisting of a former prime minister, a former foreign minister, a former chief of staff and the president of an academic institute. The progress made in 2010 is significant (New Start, NPT, etc.) but does not affect the strategic nuclear ideology of mutual nuclear deterrence. This was related to the threats of the last century, not to those of the 21st century. Worse: it spurs on missile defense and hampers cooperation. The next phase in nuclear disarmament should include third nuclear powers. As Russia needs to maintain its defence strength, including nuclear arms, to protect itself, the way to nuclear disarmament is through growing confidence and strengthening international stability. A multilateral approach is needed for missile defence, conventional weapons, non-nuclear carriers and outer-space militarization. "(...)We have come to the conclusion that the world without nuclear weapons is not simply the present-day world minus nuclear weapons. We need an international system mainly built upon other principles and institutions." Nuclear disarmament is only possible in the context of deep reorganization of the entire international system. Must be related to global economy, energy, ecology, climate, demographics, epidemics, criminality, religious and ethnic conflicts. Nuclear disarmament must be part of reorganizing international life on a more civilized basis.

(See Note LH added to 1.25)

1.23. 'NATO must support nuclear disarmament in Europe in its strategy'

by Tarja Cronberg, Gustav Hägglund, Elisabeth Rehn and Erkki Tuomioja
Finnish article in the *Helsingin Sanomat*, 14 November 2010

<http://www.hs.fi/paakirjoitus/artikkeli/Naton+on+tuettava+strategiassaan++ydinaseiden+riisuntaa+Euroopassa/HS20101114SI1MA01i4y>

A distinguished Finnish group, but no English translation to be found.

1.24. 'A Post-Nuclear Euro-Atlantic Security Order'

by Sam Nunn, Igor Ivanov, Wolfgang Ischinger
Project Syndicate, 14 December 2010

<http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/nunn1/English>

Also published in *The Moscow Times*, 13 January 2011

<http://www.themoscowtimes.com/opinion/article/a-post-nuclear-euro-atlantic-security-order/428500.html>

Three senior U.S., Russian and German observers list 7 measures, nr. 1 being "*increasing assured warning and decision times for the launch of nuclear-armed ballistic missiles.*" They also call for a dialogue between Russia, the U.S. and NATO on Tactical Nuclear Weapons (TNW). Their main plea is for a Euro-Atlantic security community, including economic, energy and environmental dimensions. "*Pursuing arrangements that increase warning and decision-making time for all countries in the Euro-Atlantic region would introduce stability into the NATO-Russia relationship. Adjustments in operational doctrine, as applied to strategic, tactical, and conventional forces, would constitute a giant step toward ending the relationship's militarized framework.*"

1.25. 'Deterrence in the Age of Nuclear Proliferation'

by George P. Schultz, William J. Perry, Henry A. Kissinger and Sam Nunn
The Wall Street Journal, 7 March 2011

http://www.nti.org/c_press/Deterrence_in_the_Age_of_Nuclear_Proliferation.pdf

Their fourth annual op-ed. Again arguing that MAD and Flexible Response belong to the past. *"Does the world want to continue to bet its survival on continued good fortune with a growing number of nuclear nations and adversaries globally?"* Among the 2011 proposals is the recognition that *"continued reliance on nuclear weapons as the principal element for deterrence is encouraging, or at least excusing, the spread of these weapons (...)"* The issue of TNW is mentioned, like in previous statements, but again the text is weak. They must be included in further steps, etc. And *"Changes to extended deterrence must be developed over time by the U.S. and allies working closely together."* The new op-ed echoes what was said in the Russian text (see 1.22): *"A world without nuclear weapons will not simply be today's world minus nuclear weapons."*

(Note LH: This last phrase had already been used in several previous church statements to the EU, NATO, the U.S. and Russia, see for instance http://csc.ceceurope.org/fileadmin/filer/csc/Nuclear_Disarmament/Final_CSC_of_CEC_Statement_on_the_EU_Policy_to_the_NPT_RevCon_2010.pdf . However, in church statements it aims at encouraging a broader approach to security, whereas in political statements it often serves to discourage expectations that progress can be fast, just like *"perhaps not in my lifetime"* has become the most quoted phrase in Obama's April 2009 Prague speech).

1.26. 'Moving Ahead on Reducing Nuclear Arms'

by Madeleine Albright and Igor Ivanov

The New York Times, 6 April 2011

<http://nonukes.nl/blog/albright-and-ivanov-urge-their-governments-to-accelerate-disarmament#>

The former U.S. secretary of state and the former Russian foreign minister call for building on the momentum of the entry into force of New START (Feb. 2011). The U.S. and Russia should implement more and faster reductions, cooperate in missile defense (a joint NATO-Russia centre is one of the suggestions), address non-strategic nuclear weapons in their arms reductions negotiations, and bring other nuclear weapons states into the nuclear arms control process.

(Note LH: it is interesting that they refer to the 1991/92 Presidential Nuclear Initiatives, or PNI's, which were unilateral but reciprocal and were by far the most significant nuclear disarmament measures in the nuclear age).

1. 27 'The Race Between Cooperation and Catastrophe'

by Sam Nunn, December 2011

In: *Reducing Nuclear Risks in Europe: A Framework for Action*. NTI Report edited by Steve Andreasen and Isabelle Williams, December 2011

<http://www.nti.org/newsroom/news/reducing-nuclear-risks-europe-now-available-feature-essay-sam-nunn/>

Featured essay by the former U.S. senator in a report by the Nuclear Threat Initiative. Ten proposals for NATO (summit in May 2012 in Chicago), with emphasis on withdrawing U.S. TNW from Europe within five years. Also plea for increasing warning and decision time, as in previous articles by Nunn. Warns against 'significant risk' of a terrorist attack against a European NATO nuclear base. *"The rationale for maintaining U.S. and Russian tactical nuclear weapons in Europe for another decade is dangerously out of date, for both countries and for Europe."*

1.28. 'Toward a World Without Nukes'

by Helmut Schmidt and Sam Nunn

The New York Times, 13 April 2012

http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/14/opinion/toward-a-world-without-nukes.html?_r=3&ref=global

Like the essay above, proposals for the NATO summit in May 2012 in Chicago. *"In Chicago, NATO (...) should plan for further reductions of U.S. tactical nuclear weapons in Europe. The target of completing consolidation to the United States should be within five years, with the timing and pace determined by broad political and security developments between NATO and Russia, including but not limited to Russian tactical nuclear deployments near NATO's border."* Maintaining the nuclear status quo runs an unacceptable risk. As to Russia's TNW: *"A dialogue among the United States, NATO and Russia focused on accountability, transparency, reductions and elimination should be a high priority and should not await formal agreements."* Plea for increasing warning and decision time, and for a broad NATO-Russia discussion of Euro-Atlantic security.

1.29. 'Nuclear weapon reductions must be part of strategic analysis'

by Henry Kissinger and Bent Scowcroft

The Washington Post, 23 April 2012

http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/nuclear-weapon-reductions-must-be-part-of-strategic-analysis/2012/04/22/gIQAKG4iaT_story.html

or try <http://tinyurl.com/ca49xym>

Kissinger and Scowcroft (former National Security Advisor) seem to depart from 'zero' and advocate strategic stability in the sense of maintaining a strategic forces of sufficient size to prevent first strike. They stress that *"(...) the goal of future negotiations should be strategic stability and (...) lower numbers of weapons should be a consequence of strategic analysis, not an abstract preconceived determination."* Zero is not even mentioned as a long term goal. *"Nuclear weapons will continue to influence the international landscape as part of strategy and an aspect of negotiation. The lessons learned throughout seven decades need to continue to govern the future."*

1.30. 'Why Europe Still Needs Nuclear Deterrence'

by Imants Liegis, Linas Linkevicius, Janusz Onyszkiewicz

Project Syndicate, 17 May 2012

<http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/why-europe-still-needs-nuclear-deterrence>

Three former ministers of defense, of Latvia, Lithuania and Poland, repeat their endorsement of a world free of nuclear weapons but, with a view of NATO's summit in May 2012 in Chicago, stress that NATO must maintain its current mix of capabilities, including U.S. TNW in Europe. Unilateral withdrawals would increase disparity with Russia's TNW and add to concerns about America's commitment to Europe.

1.31 'The Challenge for NATO in Chicago'

by Des Browne and Volker Rühle

New York Times, 17 May 2012

<http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/18/opinion/the-challenge-for-nato-in-chicago.html>

Two former defense ministers, of the U.K. and Germany, addressing the NATO summit on 21 and 22 May in Chicago, advocate immediate 50 percent cut in U.S. TNW in Europe. They call for dialogue with Russia on removing TNW altogether and on extending warning and decision times. Plea for cooperative relationship with Russia.

1.32 'Remarks by Sidney Drell'

by Sidney Drell

Washington, D.C. 9 November 2012

<http://www.fas.org/blog/nutshell/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/Drell-FAS-Remarks-110912.pdf>

Remarks by Sidney Drell in accepting the Federation of American Scientists 2012 Public Service Award to George P. Shultz, Bill Perry, Sam Nunn, Henry A. Kissinger, and Sidney D. Drell. The award was given in recognition of the work done by these five security veterans to creating the conditions for a world without nuclear weapons. Drell ends with a quote by German Philosopher Schopenhauer: "*All truth passes through three stages:*

- *1st, it is ridiculed;*
- *2nd, it is violently opposed;*
- *3rd, it is accepted as self-evident."*

2. RESPONSES BY POLITICIANS IN OFFICE

2.01. 'A World Free of Nuclear Weapons?'

by Margaret Beckett (then British foreign secretary)

Keynote address at *International Non-proliferation Conference of Carnegie Endowment*, 25 June 2007

<http://www.carnegieendowment.org/events/?fa=1004>

Long speech, covering many aspects. In response to Kissinger c.s. she says: "*What we need is both vision - a scenario for a world free of nuclear weapons. And action - progressive steps to reduce warhead numbers and to limit the role of nuclear weapons in security policy. These two strands are separate but they are mutually reinforcing. Both are necessary, both at the moment too weak*".

2.02. 'Achieving the Vision of a World Free of Nuclear Weapons'

Conference organized by the Norwegian government

February 2008, Oslo

<http://disarmament.nrpa.no/index.php>

Speakers included George Shultz and Sam Nunn, and many other high level (former) officials. For a list, see http://disarmament.nrpa.no/?page_id=6

2.03. Speech at the Chamber of Commerce in Delhi

by UK prime minister Gordon Brown

Delhi, 21 January 2008

<http://www.number10.gov.uk/Page14323>

A quote: "*Britain is prepared to use our expertise to help determine the requirements for the verifiable elimination of nuclear warheads. And I pledge that in the run-up to the Non Proliferation Treaty review conference in 2010 we will be at the forefront of the international campaign to accelerate disarmament amongst possessor states, to prevent proliferation to new states, and to ultimately achieve a world that is free from nuclear weapons*".

2.04. 'Atlantic Cooperation and Non-Proliferation'

by Dutch foreign minister Maxime Verhagen

Speech at conference *Atlantische Commissie*, 27 March 2008.

<http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten-en-publicaties/toespraken/2010/02/10/speech-verhagen-bij-atlantische-commissie.html>

Two quotes: "*I (...) endorse the call by four American elder statesmen for a world free of nuclear weapons. (...) We should seize the opportunity of the NPT Review Conference in 2010 to show new resolve to work towards a world free of nuclear weapons.*" Initially, Verhagen refused to draw conclusions for NATO's nuclear strategy and tasks, incl. the Dutch nuclear task, but in a speech on 16 June 2008 he added that reviewing the strategic concept of NATO "*also implies taking a fresh look at the role of nuclear weapons in NATO's strategy. We are ready to work this out together with our NATO-allies.*" (Internet link no longer available). This has been Dutch policy since.

2.05. 'The UN and Security in a Nuclear-Weapon-Free World'

by UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon
Addres to East-West Institute, New York, 24 October 2008
<http://www.acronym.org.uk/docs/0810/doc12.htm>

Presentation of five-point proposal for nuclear-free world (in the presence of Kissinger and Kampelman, a.o.).

2.06. Letter of French President Sarkozy (in his capacity of President of the European Council of the EU) to UN secretary-general Ban Ki-moon

5 December 2008

http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/Sarkozy_UN_letter_20081208.pdf

This is the text of the letter. See also

<http://euobserver.com/9/27260/?rk=1> and

<http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=3855284&c=EUR>

Please note that the 'zero' aim is conspicuously absent in this letter by Sarkozy, who formally wrote the letter on behalf of the EU (at the time, France was presiding the EU) but was also 'credited' for it as President of France. However, it contains no proposals that would be new in French policy. The letter sounds far more ambitious than it is. Most likely, it was no coincidence that the letter coincided with the launching of Global Zero, see Appendix II. See also http://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/09/world/europe/09france.html?_r=1

2.07. 'A world without nuclear weapons'

by David Miliband

The Guardian, 8 December 2008

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/dec/08/nuclear-nuclearpower>

An early support by the then British foreign secretary of the vision of President-elect Obama. "*The UK is committed to working actively to create a world free from nuclear weapons.*" Six steps are proposed for new non-proliferation efforts, incl. exploration of all political military and technical issues that need to be resolved. However, Trident is not put into question.

2.08. '100 International Leaders Launch Global Zero Campaign To Eliminate Nuclear Weapons'

by Global Zero, 9 December 2008

<http://www.globalzero.org/press-release>

Launching of 'Global Zero' in Paris, with names of statesmen around the world endorsing 'zero'.

2.09. 'European Proposals for strengthening disarmament and the Non-Proliferation regime'

by Javier Solana (EU High Representative for the CFSP)

Keynote speech at the PES Conference on 'Peace and Disarmament: A World without Nuclear Weapons?', Brussels, 9 December 2008

http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/presdata/EN/discours/104602.pdf

Emphasis on the need to make the NPT review conference in 2010 a success. Explanation of EU Strategy against the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (adopted in 2003), but virtually no attention for the policy goal of a nuclear-free world, just

acknowledging 'fresh thinking' in the US. (The EU was unable to really endorse 'zero', due to French resistance).

2.10. David Miliband sets out six-point plan to rid world of nuclear weapons

Article in *The Guardian*, 4 February 2009

<http://www.guardian.co.uk:80/politics/2009/feb/04/miliband-nuclear-weapons>

This is an article about a speech by the then British foreign secretary at the IISS in which he presented a new policy paper. Miliband's six steps program – now clearly in response to President Obama's new policy - is virtually the same as the one in his *The Guardian* article of 8 December 2008, see 2.10. New is the proposal for a 'strategic dialogue' between the five recognized nuclear weapons states to lay the groundwork for the reduction and ultimate elimination of all arsenals and "to prevent nuclear weapons from ever re-emerging".

The 60 p. report is called '**Lifting the Nuclear Shadow: Creating the Conditions for Abolishing Nuclear Weapons**'. See:

<http://www.fco.gov.uk/resources/en/pdf/pdf1/nuclear-paper>

The annex has a long list of relevant reports and websites, incl. of NGO's and peace movements. Although the conclusions don't mention Trident, it seems clear that of the two European nuclear weapon states the UK is on a track quite different from France. (Moreover, the UK and Norway are cooperating in technical research on verification).

2.11. 'UK does not need a nuclear deterrent'

by Field Marshal Lord Bramall, General Lord Ramsbotham and General Sir Hugh Beach.
The Times, January 16, 2009

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/letters/article5525682.ece>

Three well-known retired British military officers address the contradiction between the statements of Gordon Brown and of Douglas Hurd et al. (see par. 1.07) in support of a nuclear-free world and their insistence on a successor to Trident.

2.12. Speeches by US and European politicians at the 2009 Munich Security Conference

February 2009, see:

http://www.securityconference.de/archive/konferenzen/reden.php?menu_2009=&menu_konferenzen=&sprache=en&jahr=2009&

Besides high-level US speakers also many Europeans, incl. Merkel, Ivanov, Sarkozy, Miliband, Solana, De Hoop Scheffer, etc.

2.13. Joint Statement by President Dmitriy Medvedev of the Russian Federation and President Barack Obama of the United States of America

London, 1 April 2009

http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Joint-Statement-by-President-Dmitriy-Medvedev-of-the-Russian-Federation-and-President-Barack-Obama-of-the-United-States-of-America/

Important text in Obama's 'reset' of the relations with Moscow. The key quote: "As leaders of the two largest nuclear weapons states, we agreed to work together to fulfill our obligations under Article VI of the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and demonstrate leadership in reducing the number of nuclear weapons in the world. We committed our two countries to achieving a nuclear free world, while

recognizing that this long-term goal will require a new emphasis on arms control and conflict resolution measures, and their full implementation by all concerned nations."

2.14. The speech in Prague in which President Obama announced his plans for a world free of nuclear weapons

Prague, 5 April 2009

http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-By-President-Barack-Obama-In-Prague-As-Delivered/

Obama's most prominent speech thus far on the U.S. commitment to a world free of nuclear weapons. Delivered in Prague during visit to Europe that included a meeting with Medvedev in London (see above), the celebration of NATO's 60th anniversary in Strasbourg/Kehl, and a meeting with the EU. From now on, all other statements refer to this Obama speech, soon called 'historic'. Obama speaks against the fatalism of believing that the further spread of nuclear weapons is unavoidable. The U.S. has a special responsibility, being the only country to have used n.w's. *"So today, I state clearly and with conviction America's commitment to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons. (Applause.) I'm not naive. This goal will not be reached quickly -- perhaps not in my lifetime. It will take patience and persistence. But now we, too, must ignore the voices who tell us that the world cannot change. We have to insist, "Yes, we can." (Applause.)"*

Proposals include reducing the role of nuclear weapons in the U.S. security strategy, reducing warheads and stockpiles through New START treaty, ratification of CTBT, FMCT, strengthening NPT, measures against nuclear terrorism and for strengthening nuclear security.

(Note LH: Please note that taking missiles off hair trigger alert was missing. Also note that *"perhaps not in my lifetime"* has become the quote used most often, serving the interpretation that this speech was not announcing drastic changes in U.S. nuclear policy. However, as a new commitment it was radical, and certainly more radical than it was interpreted at the time, with little attention in the European press and no references to Obama's 'zero' goal in the NATO and EU statements issued in the same days. It took some time before its historical significance was realized: from now on, 'zero' was serious).

It is impossible to list all responses of politicians in office that have been published after Obama's speech of April 2009. Moreover, most are about specific issues, such as the NPT Review Conference in May 2010, New START, NATO revising its Strategic Concept, etc. Below I have selected only few responses in 2009 and 2010.

2.15. 'Conditions towards zero – 11 benchmarks for global nuclear disarmament'

by Hirofumi Nakasone, 27 April 2009.

<http://www.mofa.go.jp/POLICY/un/disarmament/arms/state0904.html>

2.16. "Russia 'could drop nuclear arms'"

by BBC News, 10 June 2009

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8094173.stm>

2.17. The Nobel Peace Prize for 2009

Oslo, 9 October 2009

http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/2009/press.html

http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-by-the-President-on-Winning-the-Nobel-Peace-Prize/

This can also be seen as a 'European response', because of Norway's role in this. The second sentence in the Nobel Committee statement is: "*The Committee has attached special importance to Obama's vision of and work for a world without nuclear weapons.*" Obama accepted the prize as "*a call to action.*"

2.18 Coalition agreement new German Government

Berlin, 26 October 2009

<http://www.cdu.de/doc/pdfc/091026-koalitionsvertrag-cducsu-fdp.pdf> (text in German)

<http://www.cdu.de/en/doc/091215-koalitionsvertrag-2009-2013-englisch.pdf> (English)

This was the breakthrough in European support of Obama's 'zero'. On October 24, the coalition agreement between CDU/CSU and FDP lifted the taboo in NATO on discussing withdrawal of US tactical nuclear weapons. The new government expressed strong support of Obama's goal of a world free of nuclear weapons and committed itself to having them withdrawn from Germany, of course as part of NATO's revision of its Strategic Concept. The key sentence of the agreement was:

"In diesem Zusammenhang sowie im Zuge der Ausarbeitung eines strategischen Konzeptes der NATO werden wir uns im Bündnis sowie gegenüber den amerikanischen Verbündeten dafür einsetzen, dass die in Deutschland verbliebenen Atomwaffen abgezogen werden."

"In this context, as well as in the course of the drafting of a strategic concept for NATO, we will advocate within the Alliance and with our American allies the removal of the remaining nuclear weapons from Germany."

"In this context" refers to both the new government's support of Obama's new policy for a nuclear weapon free world and to the need for using the 2010 Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty for a new dynamics in arms control.

2.19. '204 Japanese Legislators Support Obama's Vision of Nuclear Disarmament'

Global Security Institute, December 2009

http://www.gs institute.org/gsi/archives/Diet_Obama.html

2.20. 'Next, the Tactical Nukes'

by Carl Bildt and Radek Sikorski, 2 February 2010.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/02/opinion/02iht-edbildt.html>

Following the new German policy, there have been many texts by European politicians on the issue of U.S. tactical nuclear weapons still being deployed in Europe, two decades after the end of the Cold War, and also the large Russian arsenals. These texts are not listed here.

2.21. 'The Moral Challenge of a Nuclear-Free World'

by Katsuya Okada and Guido Westerwelle

The Wall Street Journal, 4 September 2010

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703959704575453900642425906.html>

The foreign ministers of Japan and Germany supporting Obama's Prague speech and the action plan approved by the NPT Review Conference in May 2010.

2.22. Joint Statement by Foreign Ministers on Nuclear Disarmament and Non-proliferation.

by foreign ministers from 10 countries, New York, 22 September 2010
<http://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/fm/npt1009.html>

2.23. Group Statement on NATO Nuclear Policy

by the European Leadership Network, 27 September 2010.
<http://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/static/nato-nuclear-policy-statement.html>

Here ends the list. Many statements after Obama's Prague speech focused more specifically on the NPT Review Conference in May 2010 in New York, on New START, and on NATO's nuclear policy. I make one exception:

2.24 'Eliminating Nuclear Weapons Threats: A Call for New Focus and Energy from Political leaders'

by 25 leaders from Asia Pacific, Singapore, 13 September 2012
<http://www.nuclearsecurityproject.org/publications/eliminating-nuclear-weapons-threats-a-call-for-new-focus-and-energy-from-political-leaders>

This is a statement by 25 (former) political, diplomatic, military and scientific leaders from 14 Asia Pacific countries, including two former prime ministers of Australia and New Zealand and 10 former foreign and defense ministers of 7 countries. They deplore the loss of political momentum towards a nuclear weapons free world and call for new political focus and energy. *"All nuclear-armed states must step back from language which prioritises their security concerns over those of states which have bound themselves by treaty not to acquire such weapons; and not make their commitment to nuclear disarmament unrealistically contingent on the prior settlement of outstanding regional conflicts and disputes."*

(Note LH: see also my comments in Appendix I).

For many statements and opinion pieces on nuclear policy, see
[http://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/all-articles-briefs-and-papers_41.html?type\[\]=MemberArticle](http://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/all-articles-briefs-and-papers_41.html?type[]=MemberArticle) . See also the links in Appendix II.

APPENDIX I. Comments LH on the measures advocated (or not advocated) and a note of disappointment

In the appeals and articles mentioned in this fact sheet the following measures are frequently mentioned

- Further reductions of arsenals, especially of the USA and Russia, who control more than 90% of the world's nuclear weapons (New START).
- Changing military operational plans that still reflect the Cold War.
- Increasing security of existing stockpiles, to prevent terrorists from acquiring nuclear weapons.
- Speedy ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) (esp. by US Senate).
- A 'cut-off' treaty (prohibiting the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons).
- Measures to prevent military use of civilian nuclear-power programs, including international regimes to control the full nuclear fuel cycle (esp. the IAEA regime).
- Pressure on Iran and North Korea, and strengthening stability in Pakistan.
- Stronger security assurances to non-nuclear weapons states and Nuclear Weapon Free Zones.
- Eliminating or withdrawing forward-deployed tactical weapons.
- Resolving regional conflicts.
- Calls for policy statements by governments, declaring the will to move to 'zero' as their policy goal.
- Study of all technical and political requirements for eliminating nuclear weapons.
- Strengthening the NPT regime (which of course includes most or all of the measures above). Obviously, this is a concern shared by many. The focus until 2010 is on the NPT Review Conference in May 2010.

Less mentioned, or linked to specific events or political developments:

- Some of the key statements do *not* refer to modernization plans or pleas to halt them.
- Taking all nuclear weapons off hair-trigger alert is often mentioned in early statements but then fades away (except in texts (co)written by Sam Nunn).
- Nuclear infrastructure is rarely mentioned.
- 'No first use' is often missing in the proposals.
- Nuclear Weapon Free Zones are rarely mentioned.
- Withdrawing tactical nuclear weapons (TNW) from Europe is not a priority issue in the first two years, although TNW are mentioned in a more general sense. It only gets more weight when European statements are added, Germany commits itself to withdrawing TNW from Germany (October 2009), and the conflict in NATO about its future nuclear posture and policy further develops.

At the time of finalizing this fact sheet, a note of disappointment must be added. The momentum, built up since the first four statesmen's op-ed in January 2007 and President Obama's Prague speech in April 2009, seems to have faded. European political leaders were divided from the beginning and have contributed little to the U.S. process. Russia has other priorities. In the U.S., the question is if, in his second term, Obama will revitalize his own ideal.

- European leaders in NATO have failed to agree about changing the status quo of U.S. tactical nuclear weapons still deployed in five non-nuclear NATO members in Europe, despite their military irrelevance, the dangers of their exposure to terrorist actions, and the growing criticism in NPT meetings that NATO's nuclear sharing is inconsistent with Art. I and II of the NPT. Several countries have worked hard to contribute to the dynamics of 'zero' by eliminating these relics of the Cold War, esp. Germany. However, opposition by France and some former communist countries and lack of leadership from the U.S. have resulted in not using the 'window of opportunity' of NATO revising its Strategic Concept (2009/2010) and reviewing its deterrence and

defense posture (2011/2012). For my analysis of the outcome of NATO's Deterrence and Defense Posture Review, adopted in Chicago in May 2012, see: <http://www.nonukes.nl/en/news/nato's-deterrence-and-defence-posture-review-shows-that-consensus-is-not-possible>

- Initially, Russia seemed supportive but has done little to contribute to the dynamics of the process, giving priority to its concerns about missile defense and other issues. Moreover, it continues to see its own large arsenals of tactical nuclear weapons as a necessary compensation for its conventional weakness.
- In the U.S., it was striking that President Obama did not mention his goal of 'zero' in his Inaugural Address in January 2013 and paid very little attention to nuclear disarmament in his State of the Union on 12 February 2013. Moreover, during the confirmation hearings, new Secretary of State John Kerry translated Obama's April 2009 timeframe of '*perhaps not in my lifetime*' into '*many centuries*.' At this moment of writing, mid-February 2013, it is too early to see if this is part of a new strategy to downplay the political sensitivity of nuclear disarmament and try to achieve informal agreements with Russia not requiring U.S. Senate ratification (like the Presidential Nuclear Initiatives in 1991/92).

APPENDIX II. Some initiatives involving (former) high officials

The list below is not a survey of peace movements, NGO's or think tanks, but of initiatives involving (former) politicians and government officials. Obviously, many such officials also participate in other arms control and nuclear disarmament organizations, but I have tried to single out some which have the involvement of senior statesmen and officials as a specific goal.

- The *European Leadership network (ELN)* <http://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/>
- The *Global Security Institute (GSI)* <http://www.gsinstitute.org/>
- The *Nuclear Threat Initiative (NTI)* <http://www.nti.org/about/>
- The *Nuclear Security Project (NSP)* <http://www.nuclearsecurityproject.org/> . Based on an initiative by the members of the original 'gang of four'.
- *Global Zero*: International campaign, launched 8/9 December 2008 in Paris. <http://www.globalzero.org/>
- *The Middle Powers Initiative* <http://www.middlepowers.org/about.html>
- The *Model Nuclear Weapons Convention* <http://lcnp.org/mnwc/>, see also <http://www.acronym.org.uk/dd/dd89/89rej.htm>
- *Mayors for Peace* <http://www.mayorsforpeace.org/>
- The *Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission*, chaired by Hans Blix <http://www.wmdcommission.org/>
- The *International Commission on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament*, co-chaired by Gareth Evans (Australia) and Yoriko Kawaguchi (Japan) <http://www.icnnd.org/>
- To be added??